

speak—we just have to keep focused on this to try to address this challenge. When the public health emergency ends, we can't forget those who are dealing with long COVID, and we can't forget those who are dealing with the significant amount of mental anxiety and stress that has been present in the lives of all for the last 3 years. We have to improve our outreach and education, we have to accelerate our research to come up with treatments and cures that work, and we have to do it with a sense of urgency. I am committed to working with you all to do that.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 808. A bill to amend the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 to require the Secretary of Agriculture to expedite hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction projects on certain National Forest System land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 808

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Expediting Forest Restoration and Recovery Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. APPLICATION BY FOREST SERVICE OF AUTHORITIES TO EXPEDITE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES IN CARRYING OUT HAZARDOUS FUEL AND INSECT AND DISEASE RISK REDUCTION PROJECTS.

Section 104 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6514) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(i) APPLICATION BY FOREST SERVICE OF AUTHORITIES TO EXPEDITE ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSES IN CARRYING OUT HAZARDOUS FUEL AND INSECT AND DISEASE RISK REDUCTION PROJECTS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) INSECT AND DISEASE TREATMENT AREA.—The term ‘insect and disease treatment area’ means an area that—

“(i) is designated by the Secretary as an insect and disease treatment area under this title; or

“(ii) is designated as at risk or a hazard on the most recent National Insect and Disease Risk Map published by the Forest Service.

“(B) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ has the meaning given the term in section 101(14)(A).

“(2) USE OF AUTHORITIES.—In carrying out a hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project in an insect and disease treatment area authorized under this Act, the Secretary shall—

“(A) apply the categorical exclusion established by section 603 in the case of a hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project carried out in an area—

“(i) designated as suitable for timber production within the applicable forest plan; or

“(ii) where timber harvest activities are not prohibited;

“(B) conduct applicable environmental assessments and environmental impact statements in accordance with this section in the case of a hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project—

“(i) carried out in an area—

“(I) outside of an area described in subparagraph (A); or

“(II) where other significant resource concerns exist, as determined exclusively by the Secretary; or

“(ii) that is carried out in an area equivalent to not less than a hydrologic unit code 5 watershed, as defined by the United States Geological Survey; and

“(C) notwithstanding subsection (d), in the case of any other hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction project, in the environmental assessment or environmental impact statement prepared under subsection (b), study, develop, and describe—

“(i) the proposed agency action; and

“(ii) the alternative of no action.

“(3) PRIORITY FOR REDUCING RISKS OF INSECT INFESTATION AND WILDFIRE.—Except where established as a mandatory standard that constrains project and activity decision making in a resource management plan (as defined in section 101(13)(A)) in effect on the date of enactment of this Act, in the case of an insect and disease treatment area, the Secretary shall prioritize reducing the risks of insect and disease infestation and wildfire over other planning objectives.

“(4) INCLUSION OF FIRE REGIME GROUP IV.—Notwithstanding section 603(c)(2)(B), the Secretary shall apply the categorical exclusion described in paragraph (2)(A) to areas in Fire Regime Group IV.

“(5) EXCLUDED AREAS.—This subsection shall not apply to—

“(A) a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

“(B) an inventoried roadless area, except in the case of an activity that is permitted under—

“(i) the final rule of the Secretary entitled ‘Special Areas; Roadless Area Conservation’ (66 Fed. Reg. 3244 (January 12, 2001)); or

“(ii) a State-specific roadless area conservation rule.

“(6) REPORTS.—The Secretary shall annually make publicly available data describing the acreage treated under hazardous fuel or insect and disease risk reduction projects in insect and disease treatment areas during the previous year.”.

SEC. 3. GOOD NEIGHBOR AUTHORITY.

Section 8206(b)(2) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a(b)(2)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) TREATMENT OF REVENUE.—Funds received from the sale of timber by a Governor of a State under a good neighbor agreement shall be retained and used by the Governor—

“(i) to carry out authorized restoration services under that good neighbor agreement; and

“(ii) if funds remain after carrying out authorized restoration services under clause (i), to carry out authorized restoration services within the State under other good neighbor agreements.”.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 814. A bill to allow the Secretary of Homeland Security to designate Romania as a program country under the visa waiver program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 814

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Romania Visa Waiver Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that the Government of Romania should—

(1) undertake all steps necessary to prepare Romania for participation in the visa waiver program under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187) by developing a strategy to meet all criteria for the program; and

(2) continue to advance robust efforts to eliminate trafficking in persons, including by prioritizing the recommendations outlined in the report of the Department of State entitled “Trafficking in Persons Report” issued in July 2022.

SEC. 3. ELIGIBILITY OF ROMANIA FOR VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.

Notwithstanding any provision of section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187), the Secretary of Homeland Security may designate Romania as a program country under the visa waiver program established by that section.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 106—CONDEMNING BEIJING'S DESTRUCTION OF HONG KONG'S DEMOCRACY AND RULE OF LAW

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 106

Whereas, in 1997, Great Britain handed Hong Kong over to Chinese rule under guarantees that Hong Kong would become a Special Administrative Region under the “one country, two systems” principle, pursuant to which Hong Kong's Basic Law would apply and would enshrine “fundamental rights” of Hong Kong residents and a political structure, including an independent judiciary, the right to vote, and freedoms of assembly and speech, among others;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China (PRC) has repeatedly undermined Hong Kong's autonomy since the 1997 handover, including actions which resulted in political protests in Hong Kong, including the Umbrella Movement in 2014, a protest against Beijing's attempt to reform Hong Kong's electoral system, and the 2019–2020 protests, which opposed the Hong Kong government's attempt to implement an extradition law that would have subjected Hong Kongers to prosecution in mainland China;

Whereas the Hong Kong Police Force used excessive force to try to quell the 2019–2020 protestors, many of whom were under the age of 30;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China responded to these protests by passing and implementing the Law of the People's Republic of China on Safeguarding National Security in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (commonly referred to as the "Hong Kong national security law") a vaguely defined criminal statute that includes overly broad charges and extraterritorial reach to punish people for exercising their fundamental rights and freedoms;

Whereas, since its enactment in June 2020, this law has been used by the Government of the People's Republic of China as a pretext to crack down on legitimate and peaceful expression, including the exercise of freedoms of assembly, speech, and religious belief provided for under the Basic Law, to replace the Hong Kong legislature with individuals loyal to the Chinese Communist Party, and to pass new immigration laws that subject Hong Kong citizens and residents, as well as PRC nationals and foreign nationals, to exit bans in Hong Kong similar to those implemented in mainland China;

Whereas more than 200 people have been arrested under the Hong Kong national security law since its enactment in June 2020;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China is using the Hong Kong national security law to harass, target, and threaten non-Hong Kong citizens and those outside of Hong Kong, based upon for unsubstantiated and vague allegations of "endangering national security";

Whereas, Jimmy Lai, a 75-year-old Hong Kong pro-democracy advocate and media entrepreneur, has been targeted and persecuted for decades, most recently through multiple prosecutions, including related to exercising his rights to freedom of peaceful assembly and freedom of expression, his sentencing to over five years in prison under politically motivated fraud charges and the seizure of his multimillion dollar independent media organization Apple Daily by the Hong Kong authorities;

Whereas Mr. Lai is now one of the highest profile cases facing trial under vaguely-defined charges under the so-called "national security law";

Whereas, Cardinal Zen, a 90-year-old Roman Catholic cardinal, and five other colleagues were found guilty of politically motivated charges related to failing to register a humanitarian fund that helped anti-government protesters;

Whereas the Government of the People's Republic of China's undermining of democracy in Hong Kong has ramifications for the international order, including with regard to the future of Taiwan;

Whereas the Hong Kong government has conducted a public relations campaign to convince global business leaders that Hong Kong remains a critical and attractive international financial center, while simultaneously undermining the independence of institutions that encouraged its growth over the past several decades;

Whereas Hong Kong still maintains a separate voting share from the People's Republic of China at many multilateral organizations—including the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation forum, the Financial Action Task Force, the International Olympic Committee, and the World Trade Organization—effectively doubling the People's Republic of China's voting power at these critical institutions; and

Whereas the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act (Public Law 116-76; 22 U.S.C. 5701 note), signed into law in November 2019,

requires the President to use sanctions to promote accountability for those responsible for certain conduct that undermines fundamental freedoms and autonomy in Hong Kong: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the Government of the People's Republic of China's "Hong Kong national security law" and related human rights abuses;

(2) urges all governments that value democracy or autonomy to hold the Chinese Communist Party accountable for its destruction of Hong Kong's autonomy, rule of law, and freedoms;

(3) supports the people of Hong Kong as they fight to exercise fundamental rights and freedoms, as enumerated by—

(A) the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, done at Beijing December 19, 1984;

(B) the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, done at New York December 19, 1966; and

(C) the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, done at Paris December 10, 1948;

(4) condemns the Government of the People's Republic of China's practice of bringing false and politically motivated charges, such as fraud, against Hong Kongers in order to tarnish their reputations in advance of their national security law trials;

(5) calls upon the Hong Kong government to immediately drop all sedition and national security law-related charges and free all defendants immediately, including Jimmy Lai and Cardinal Zen;

(6) expresses extreme concern about the Government of the People's Republic of China's state-directed theft of Apple Daily, and holds that Hong Kong no longer has credibility as an international business center due to the erosion of the regulatory and legal environments that have promoted its economic growth for decades;

(7) encourages the United States Government and other governments to take steps at multilateral institutions to ensure that voting procedures recognize that there is no longer a meaningful distinction between Hong Kong and mainland China; and

(8) urges the United States Government to use all available tools, including those authorized by the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act, in response to the Government of the People's Republic of China's actions in Hong Kong.

SENATE RESOLUTION 107—RECOGNIZING THE EXPIRATION OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT PROPOSED BY CONGRESS IN MARCH 1972, AND OBSERVING THAT CONGRESS HAS NO AUTHORITY TO MODIFY A RESOLUTION PROPOSING A CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AFTER THE AMENDMENT HAS BEEN SUBMITTED TO THE STATES OR AFTER THE AMENDMENT HAS EXPIRED

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COTTON, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. VANCE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 107

Whereas article V of the Constitution of the United States gives two-thirds of the Senate and two-thirds of the House of Representatives the power to propose constitutional amendments and their mode of ratification by the States;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in *Dillon v. Gloss*, 256 U.S. 368 (1921) unanimously held that Congress may, in proposing a constitutional amendment, incorporate "a definite period for ratification [that] shall be fixed, so that all may know what it is and speculation on what is a reasonable time may be avoided ...";

Whereas the Supreme Court in the *Dillon v. Gloss* decision held that whether Congress uses its power to include such a "definite" deadline was "a matter of detail which Congress may determine as an incident of its power to designate the mode of ratification" of an amendment, which mode Congress has always dictated in the proposing clause of a resolution;

Whereas House Joint Resolution 208, 92nd Congress, referred to in this resolution as the "Equal Rights Amendment Resolution" contained a ratification deadline of 7 years in the proposing clause of the resolution, as has every constitutional amendment submitted by Congress to the States since 1960, and proposed an amendment referred to in this resolution as the "Equal Rights Amendment";

Whereas, in *Illinois v. Ferriero*, No. 21-5096 (D.C. Cir. 2023), a unanimous ruling issued on February 28, 2023, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit rejected the claim of the Attorneys General of Illinois and Nevada that a deadline in a proposing clause is not effective, with the court calling that claim "unpersuasive" and observing that "if that were the case, then the specification of the mode of ratification in every amendment in our nation's history would also be inoperative";

Whereas, in the same unanimous ruling, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit noted that the Supreme Court has affirmed the authority of Congress to set a binding ratification deadline, and the court of appeals refused to order the Archivist to certify the Equal Rights Amendment as part of the Constitution and dismissed the lawsuit brought by Illinois and Nevada;

Whereas Representative Martha Griffiths, the sponsor of the Equal Rights Amendment Resolution, said in 1971, speaking of the deadline for the Equal Rights Amendment, "I think it is perfectly proper to have the 7-year statute so that it should not be hanging over our heads forever.";

Whereas, under article V of the Constitution, a proposed amendment does not become part of the Constitution unless it is either "ratified by the Legislatures of three fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three fourths thereof" with one or the other mode of ratification being dictated by Congress in the proposing clause of a resolution;

Whereas only 35 States ratified the Equal Rights Amendment before its 7-year deadline, resulting in fewer than the 38 State ratifications necessary for adoption under article V of the Constitution;

Whereas, before the original deadline for the Equal Rights Amendment expired, 4 of the 35 States that voted to ratify voted to rescind their ratifications;

Whereas Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg in 2020 observed, when explaining why she thought the Equal Rights Amendment needed to start over, "If you count a latecomer on the plus side, how can you disregard States that said we've changed our minds?";

Whereas, in *Idaho v. Freeman*, 529 F. Supp. 1107 (D. Idaho 1981), Judge Marion Callister